

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Tran in the September 9, 2005 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,960,448 to Reichek et al. (Reichek), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0116420 A1 to Allam et al. (Allam). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully understand that this rejection is directed to claims 1 and 6 only, as no grounds for rejection of claims 2-5 are provided, and claims 2-5 are separately rejected.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, displaying a thumbnail corresponding to an original document and including an enhancement in appearance as displayed on the thumbnail.

The Office Action refers to col. 4, lines 25-40 of Reichek as allegedly teaching this feature. As discussed during the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that this section relates to a preview window 330 that displays an enhanced image of an original document 199, not a thumbnail. As described at col. 9, lines 22-35, the preview window 330 displays a photo-realistic image of an original document. In other words, what is shown in the preview window 333 is the original document. Therefore, Reichek does not teach or suggest this feature.

Applicants respectfully submit that Reichek teaches a thumbnail picture at col. 10, lines 3-6. However, as discussed during the interview, the thumbnail of Reichek is a thumbnail picture of a visual enhancement, such as a highlight or a blow-up. It is not a

thumbnail picture corresponding to the original image and including an enhancement in appearance, as recited in claim 1.

Allam does not overcome the deficiency of Reichek with respect to this feature.

Claim 1 further recites displaying a first version of the original document, at least a portion of the first version being more similar in visual appearance to a corresponding portion of the thumbnail than to a corresponding portion of the original document based on comparison of the at least a portion of the first version to the corresponding portion of the original document and the corresponding portion of the thumbnail. The Office Action admits that Reichek does not teach this feature, but alleges that Allam does.

The Office Action refers to paragraph [0053] through paragraph [0056] of Allam as allegedly teaching this feature. As discussed during the interview, this section generally relates to extracting information from a physical page and displaying the extracted information.

Applicants respectfully submit that Allam does not teach or suggest a thumbnail and therefore that Allam does not arguably teach or suggest that a portion of the first version is more similar in visual appearance to a corresponding portion of the thumbnail than to a corresponding portion of the original document. During the interview, Examiner Tran asserted that the annotations 124, 196 and 198 shown in Fig. 10 might be considered as thumbnails. However, as discussed and agreed during the interview, a thumbnail is a reduced representation of an original document. The annotations 124, 196 and 198 are merely an indication of portions of the electronic page view 130. Moreover, if the annotations 124, 196 and 198 are considered to be thumbnails, Applicants respectfully submit that Allam fails to teach or suggest the "more similar in visual appearance" feature recited in claim 1 because the annotations 124, 196 and 198 are in fact parts of the original electronic view 130 (e.g., the

visual appearance of the information within the annotation 124 is the same as the visual appearance of the information at the position corresponding to the annotation 124) as shown in Fig. 10. Therefore, the similarity to the annotations 124 is the same as to the original electronic page view 130, and thus the extracted information in the display area 126 is not more similar in visual appearance to a corresponding portion of the thumbnail than a corresponding portion of the original document, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the applied references.

Claim 6 is an apparatus claim reciting a controller that displays the thumbnail image via the display device, the thumbnail corresponding to an original document and including an enhancement in appearance, and displays a first version of the original document via the display device, at least a portion of the first version being more similar in visual appearance to a corresponding portion of the thumbnail than to a corresponding portion of the original document based on comparison of the at least a portion of the first version to the corresponding portion of the original document and the corresponding portion of the thumbnail. Similar to claim 1, the applied references does not teach or suggest these features. As such, claim 6 is patentable over the applied references.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-5, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Reichek in view of Allam. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-5, 7 and 8 are patentable at least for their dependence on claims 1 and 6, as well as for the additional features they recite.

In particular, with respect to claims 2-4, 7 and 8, the Office Action states that claims 2-4, 7 and 8 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1. Applicants

respectfully disagree and submit that the Office Action improperly rejects these claims without providing a factual basis.

For example, claims 2 and 7 recite a second version of the original document in which a portion corresponding to the at least a portion of the first version is more similar in visual appearance to the corresponding portion of the original document than to the corresponding portion of the first version based on comparison. The second version of the original document is not similar to the first version because the portion of the first version is more similar in visual appearance to the corresponding portion of the original document than to the corresponding portion of the first version. The Office Action simply does not address this feature.


Applicants respectfully submit that because none of the applied references teaches the recited first version of the original document, the applied references do not teach or suggest the second version of the original document in which a portion corresponding to the at least a portion of the first version is more similar in visual appearance to the corresponding portion of the original document than to the corresponding portion of the first version based on comparison.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Klifton L. Kime
Registration No. 42,733

JAO:KLK/tls

Date: September 15, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 24-0037